

**REMARKS**

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro, dated 9 Feb 2005.

Claims 1-2, and 4-31 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

***Specification***

The specification has been objected to for having an abstract of less than 50 words. Applicant has expanded the abstract to meet the minimum requirement.

Claims 2 and 3 have been objected to for the phrase "data displaying to said user information".

Applicant responds that the original claim language accurately sets forth the intended meaning, but has amended claim 2 to further clarify that meaning. Claim 3 has been canceled and incorporated in claim 1.

**35 U.S.C. 101**

LOT920010026US1

13

S/N 10/045,918

Claims 10-20, and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner characterizes these claims as "a method for displaying information..." However, while claim 10, which depends from claim 1, is a method, claims 11-20 are system claims, and the rejection has not been extended to claims 1-9, which are in the same set with claim 10.

Consequently, applicant is of the opinion that there has been some typographical error, and will assume for the purpose of this response that the 101 rejection extends to all of claims 1-10, 11-20, and 31.

Applicant assumes that the Examiner's objection is to the phrase "and/or", which he quite properly points out "lacks assured results and therefore is not concrete" [Office Action, page 3, paragraph 4]. Applicant has amended all claims including the phrase objected.

The Examiner's rejection also indicates that the remainder of claims may not be tied to a technological art, environment or machine. Applicant has amended the all independent claims to clarify the technological art aspect

LOT920010026US1

14

S/N 10/045,918

of his invention.

**35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1-6, 11-16, 21-26, and 31 have been rejected over Senechalle et al ("Senechalle", U.S. 2002/0191028).

Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that applicant's invention provides for textual and graphical data selectively in each side of a frame border, and that to clarify that textual and graphical data identifies the border as a frame border which can be positioned, sized, and opened and closed by a user selectively clicking on and dragging the border.

Senechalle shows in Fig. 1 buttons that act on a frame. However, these buttons are shown only in a frame caption or frame title. Applicant's invention, on the other hand, extends the ability to incorporate textual and graphical data in all four sides of a frame border.

Further, Senechalle does not include a graphic in a border which shows applicant's claimed functionality, that is, that this is a frame that can be resized. Rather, in Senechalle, a cursor is changed as it is dragged over the

LOT920010026US1

15

S/N 10/045,918

frame to provide an indication that clicking the cursor will resize the frame.

Senechalle does show a maximize/minimize toggle icon button in a title bar. Applicant, however, extends this to allow a user to specify the behavior of a click in any side of a frame border: for example, to open and close.

Senechalle does show a hotspot. However, the actions specified for such a hotspot all act on a current application within the frame. Applicant, on the other hand, provides a hotspot in the border that can be used to start other applications.

Senechalle does show navigating between frames and bring a frame into focus. However, unlike applicant's invention, Senechalle does not discuss interacting with any side of a frame border to do so. Further, applicant's invention provides a graphic in a frame border which clarifies which of two adjacent frames responds to a click in the border.

All of the claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-16, 21-26, and 31 include these distinctions from Senechalle. Applicant

LOT920010026US1

16

S/N 10/045,918

requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Senechalle in view of Bruce ("Bruce", Same Teach Yourself Macromedia Dreamweaver 3, in 24 Hours).

With respect to claim 7, Bruce relates to adding a title to the frame title area. Applicant's amended claims, on the other hand, provide for including textual and graphical data selectively in all four sides of the border.

With respect to claim 8, Bruce deals with text processor formatting alignment icons in a tool bar, these are not in any of the four sides of a frame border. Applicant's frame properties specifically relate to the frame border. Applicant allows the user to specify alignment of text within all sides of the frame border. Bruce's alignment icons are in a tool bar that governs alignment of text within a document.

Claims 10, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28 and 30 are similarly

LOT920010026US1

17

S/N 10/045,918

distinguished from Senechalle and Bruce.

Claims 9, 19, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Senechalle in view of Bruce and further in view of Angiulo et al ("Angiulo", US 2002/0135621).

Angiulo is specific to the frame caption or title area, and not to all four (the other three) borders.

Again, applicant's invention relates to putting text and graphics in all four borders, and not just the frame caption. The art cited does have four borders, but all of the art speaks to the frame caption area, which is just a top border (when present).

Applicants request that claims 9, 19, and 29 be allowed.

#### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-2, 3-31.

LOT920010026US1

18


S/N 10/045,918

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

M. E. Carroll

By

  
Shelley M Beckstrand  
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 23 May 2005

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.  
Attorney at Law

61 Glenmont Road  
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972  
Fax: (276) 238-1545

LOT920010026US1

19

S/N 10/045,918